

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 16, 2007.

Claims 1-67 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-67.

The present Response amends claims 1, 18, 34, and 50 and cancels claim 67, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-66. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

A. Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 101

Claim 67 is rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 67 is canceled in this response.

B. Claims Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-13, 17, 22, 24, 34, 39, 41-45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 58, 59, 60-62, 66 and 67 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Geary (Graphic Java).

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19-21, 25-29, 33, 35-38, 54, 55, 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Schildt (Java 2, The Complete Reference).

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Schildt and further in view of Zaika (US 2004/0056894 A1).

Claims 14, 15, 16, 46-48, 63, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Zaika (US 2004/0056894 A1).

Here, independent claim 1 is amended to include statement of “*providing for the representation of the GUI as a desktop object and a set of objects wherein the objects are organized in a logical hierarchy and the desktop object contains one or more personalized views of one or more portals.*” Applicants respectfully submit that Geary does not teach the desktop

object that contains one or more personalized views or user views of one or more portals, even further in view of Schildt and Zaika. Therefore, independent claim 1 should be in allowable condition. Hence, dependent claim 2-17 which is based on allowable independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition.

Furthermore, independent claims 18, 34, and 50 are similarly amended as claim 1. Therefore, independent claims 18, 34, and 50 should all be in allowable condition, at least for the same reason as stated above. Hence, dependent claims 19-33 which are based on allowable independent claim 18; dependent claims 35-49 which are based on allowable independent claims 34; and dependent claims 51-66 which are based on allowable independent claim 67 should all be in allowable condition.

C. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 10, 2007

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800